DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 221 SO 010 463

AUTHOR Hesselbart, Susan
TITLE Dimensions of Public Opinion Support for Occupational Sex-Segregation.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 29p.; Revision of a paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Economic Factors; Females; Males; *Occupational Aspiration; *Public Opinion; Reverse Discrimination; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Science Research; Sociology; *Working Women

ABSTRACT

Public support for identifying certain occupations as more suitable for men, and others as more suitable for women, is analyzed, on the basis of interviews with a sample of 112 men and 133 women during 1976 in Tallahassee, Florida. The study focussed on the relationship of this occupational sex segregation to (1) economic competition between men and women, and (2) general ideology about the roles men and women should have in society. For both men and women, it was found that support for occupational sex segregation is strongly and positively related to support for different roles for men and women in society in general, while there is only a weak relationship between support for occupational sex segregation and feelings about economic competition between men and women. The strongest support for occupational sex segregation was found among black women and women with lower socioeconomic status. (Author/IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

NOV 1 1 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Hesselbart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED147221

DIMENSIONS OF PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

Susan Hesselbart
Department of Sociology
Florida State University

SP010463

Revision of a paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, 1977, Chicago.

Gratitude is expressed to all Project TAL participants, and especially to Glenda Norvell and Lori Monda for research assistance. Comments by Muriel Cantor, Carolyn Dexter, Ronald Pavalko and Richard Simpson were useful in revising earlier drafts of this manuscript.

DIMENSIONS OF PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

The increase of gainfully employed American women following World War Two is well known. Increasingly as well, public opinion data support women's labor force participation (Gallup, 1976; Mason, et al., 1976). With a majority of American women in the labor force sometime during 1976, future issues appear to concern not whether women will work outside the home, but which women, when during their life cycles, and the types of jobs held by women and men.

This study examines one facet of women's (and men's) labor force participation: public opinion support of occupational sex-segregation. Of particular interest are factors which may lead individuals to support occupational sex-typing. One set of factors is suggested from arguments about potential cross-sex economic competition and how competitive threats help occupational segregation to continue. Juxtaposed against economic factors is a different perspective which suggests that public opinion support for a sex-segregated labor force is one subset of general support for a sex-segregated society.

OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

Occupational sex-segregation in America is well documented (Gross, 1968; McLaughlin, 1977; Snyder and Hudis, 1976). Even methodological critiques of earlier studies (e.g., Williams, 1975) support the conclusion that such segregation is still considerable. Occupational segregation has many implications. For example, "equal pay for equal work" means comparably little if each sex enters different jobs and "women's work" pays less than "men's" (Snyder and Hudis, 1976; McLaughlin, 1977).

Many factors help perpetuate occupational segregation. Despite some changes, educational training is highly sex-typed. Women still form a minority in male-dominated professional and vocational programs, while few men enter female-dominated programs (Roby, 1975; U.S. Department of Commerce, 1976). In addition, young people still aspire to gender-congruent, largely sex-typed occupations (e.g., Siegel, 1973; Tully, et al., 1976). The literature on both sex-linked educational patterns and occupational aspirations suggests that individual support for occupational sex-segregation is internalized long before individuals enter the labor force.

PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

Occupational sex-ratios, occupational training, and sex-typed occupational aspirations are mirrored in general public attitudes. Pieced together, public opinion data suggest that there is sizable resistance to women entering male-dominated blue collar work or to men entering female-dominated occupations (e.g., Duncan, et al., 1973; Fox, 1975; Hesselbart, 1977; Schlossberg and Goodman, 1972). For example, a 1976 Gallup poll found that a majority of both sexes believed men were "better at" police work, truck-driving, fire-fighting and auto repair, while women were "better at" nursing, secretarial work, and elementary education. Less sex-typing occurred on fields such as medicine, law, or banking.[1]

These attitudes appear to be an additional source of continued occupational segregation. Individuals who aspire to, train for, and enter highly gender-congruent occupations are, in fact, operating consistently with a set of social norms which indicate which occupations are gender appropriate. Such norms, when

adhered to by both sexes, help ensure that occupational sex-segregation continues with relatively minimal social disruption and buttress institutional support for a dual labor market.

Several factors are explored below which have been posited to explain sex-segregation in the labor force on a structural level. Since structural variables impinge on individual experiences, these factors may be useful when applied to public opinion data pertaining to occupational sex-segregation as well.

ECONOMIC ARGUMENTS

One theme prevalent among those studying occupational segregation concerns economic competition and occupational exclusion. Using arguments borrowed from racial segregation (e.g., Bonacich, 1972), they propose that women will (or must) work for less income than men. As a cheaper labor force, women who enter male-dominated occupations threaten to lower male income. To prevent competition, women are excluded from these occupations. If many women enter an occupation and if wages drop, men leave for better paying work and the occupation becomes largely female (see reviews in Hodge and Hodge, 1965; Blau and Jusenius, 1976; Snyder and Hudis, 1976). It is suggested that ethnic economic competition is more common in capitalistic societies (Bonacich, 1976), but it should be noted that occupational sex-segregation and "lower-priced" female labor cross-cut capitalistic and non-capitalistic countries (e.g., Blaxall and Reagan, 1976).

While these economic arguments generally refer to excluding women from male-dominated work, women <u>also</u> face within and cross-sex occupational competition. Within sex competition occurs because most women enter relatively few

occupations. When men do enter female-dominated fields, they often occupy higher level positions (e.g., Grimm and Stern, 1974; Roby, 1975). Competition may be reflected in the ambivalent attitudes of women in largely female occupations toward their male colleagues (e.g., Segal, 1962).

If economic arguments hold, there are several implications for public opinion on occupational segregation. First, both sexes have some stake in restricting potential competition. However, since men currently have more occupational alternatives and higher paying jobs than women, support for occupational sex-segregation should be higher among men. Second, persons of different socio-economic status might be differentially affected by cross-sex competition and differentially support occupational segregation (see "Economic Competition and Economic Status" below). Third, those who are sensitive to economic insecurity or who value employment aspects which could be threatened by competition (e.g., high pay) should be more likely to support occupational sex-segregation.

These economic arguments suggest that occupational segregation support need not relate to other negative attitudes toward women (or men). For example, Hodge and Hodge (1965: 251) stress that occupational segregation can occur independent of prejudice against the competing group. However, the Hodges note that prejudice against an easily identifiable group may result from economic competition (see also Bonacich, 1972) or that "employer tastes" may reflect prejudice.

OCCUPATIONAL AND NON-OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION

Competitive factors are not the only factors proposed to explain occupational sex-segregation. Further, doubts exist about the "economic rationality" of this process. For example, at least one researcher has found (McLaughlin, 1977) that mixed sex occupations, not predominantly male ones, have the highest

average income.[2] On the average, women are not found in the lowest status occupations, but in middle status jobs (e.g., McClendon, 1976). Arguments supporting the lower labor price of women often emphasize women who "temporarily work" to supplement their husbands' incomes, even though most women work because of economic necessity, and, even now, about 40 percent of employed women are not married. And, in the long run, unions and other worker associations gain more if all employees earn basic wages than if excluded subgroups are available to break strikes or undercut (white male) wages.

Alternatively, some researchers propose that dual labor markets occur because the sexes play separate (often unequal) roles in familial, political, and other subsystems. Behavior and values which support non-labor market segregation generalize to occupations (and vice-versa; e.g., Fox, 1975; Lipman-Blumen, 1976). Without periods of crisis, sex-segregation is self-perpetuating, and, because it is practiced in so many areas, relatively resilient to change. When women's inequality accompanies segregation, such arguments imply that (1) women are paid less because they are women and (2) substantial change must occur if men are not to leave occupations women enter or avoid female-dominated work, no matter what its status.

Economic arguments suggest that traditional sex-role attitudes need not (but could) relate to support for occupational sex-segregation. In contrast, general segregation arguments definitely imply that those who resist changing roles for women and men will also support labor market segregation. Economic factors here become important indirectly, by possibly changing individuals' viewpoints on sex roles in general. Status factors which emphasize cognitive change (e.g., education) would carry more indirect importance than variables such as income.

GENERAL STUDY DESIGN

This study reports new data to analyze public opinion support for occupational sex-segregation, using a measure similar to Gallup's (1976) in which respondents react to a systematic set of occupations. This public opinion data is analyzed using variables relevant to competition and systemic segregation approaches. While the data deal with attitudes relevant to sex-segregation, systematic links are made with structural issues such as occupational sex-ratios or prestige.

METHODS

THE SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS

The data describe 245 labor force adults (112 men, 133 women) interviewed during 1976 in a simple random household sample of the Tallahassee, Florida urban area.[3] The sample is relatively young (median age, 35 years), well-educated (median education, 13 years) and 76 percent white.

The area is largely a white collar community: 54 percent of sample men and 32 percent of women hold professional or managerial jobs. Fifteen percent of men and 39 percent of women are in clerical or sales work, while 31 percent of men and 29 percent of women hold blue collar jobs ($X^2_{[2]} = 18.83$, $p < .001$). Respondents are also in sex-typed fields: 75 percent of men, but 11 percent of women hold jobs which were under 26 percent female in 1970. Conversely, four percent of men but 54 percent of women are in jobs at least 75 percent female in 1970 ($X^2_{[2]} = 112.98$, $p < .001$). All further analyses are presented by sex of respondent.

MEASURING SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

Respondents were asked whether each of 18 detailed census occupations was "a lot better for a man to enter, a little better for a man, a lot better for a woman to enter, a little better for a woman, or equally good for men and women." Occupations were selected from an earlier study in which Bose (1973) used occupations with varying sex-ratios and prestige. For this study, Bose's 108 occupations were stratified by NORC score and 1970 sex-ratio, creating nine approximately equal cells. Jobs from 26 to 74 percent female were called "equal participation" jobs, while jobs over 74 and under 26 percent female were denoted "female" and "male" dominated occupations. NORC scores were roughly divided into terciles. Two occupations were randomly drawn from each cell.[4] Respondents were also asked to list any occupations women should not do and which men should not do.

Following data collection, occupations which at least 25 percent of the sample felt were at least "a little better" for men were recategorized as "male oriented." In order of response extremity, coal miner, auto mechanic, airline pilot, janitor, hotel manager, and insurance agent fell in this category. Seven jobs (in order of response extremity): baby sitter, secretary, nurse hairdresser, grade school teacher, florist, and social worker, were denoted "female oriented," since at least 25 percent felt these jobs were "a lot" or "a little better for women." Five items (accountant, medical doctor, high school teacher, post office clerk and laundry work) fit neither category.[5] It is instructive to note that the rank order of occupational item means is highly related to 1970 occupational sex-ratios ($r_s = .92$, $p < .001$) but unrelated to occupational NORC score ($r_s = -.04$).[6]

The "support for occupational sex-segregation" measure was created from the average score of items in the "male" (after reverse coding) and "female" oriented occupations. The correlation between these two sets is high (r = .71), and indicates those who believe male occupations are "better for men" also believe female occupations are "better for women."[7] Scores range from one to five (high support). As predicted, mean scores are reliably, although slightly, higher for men ($\bar{x}$ = 3.95) than for women ($\bar{x}$ = 3.80, t = 2.08, $p < .05$).

RESULTS

ECONOMIC COMPETITION AND ECONOMIC STATUS

Theoretically, gender-based occupational competition could occur in most occupations. In practice, the situation is different since individuals aspire to, train for, and enter sex-linked occupations, which, in turn, differ in characteristics such as income or racial composition. How occupational sex-segregation is interpreted in terms of potential competition may well depend on an individual's status and on contextual factors.

Five predictors of occupational sex-segregation support are presented in this section which tap aspects of economic status potentially related to occupational competition. Respondent's NORC score and earned annual income measure achieved job success. Implications of these variables may differ by gender. For example, the impact of less occupational segregation would be most beneficial to low status women, since less occupational sex-typing could allow them more access to better paid male-dominated blue collar work. If these women had more occupational choice, low-skilled "women's work" might have a lower supply of workers, lessening female intra-sex competition. Economic arguments suggest

that highly skilled or better paid men may wish to exclude women to keep their own income high. However, low-skilled men have relatively few occupational alternatives and may also wish to exclude women from tneir occupations. Thus, predictions for men using income and occupational prestige carry some ambiguity.

A third variable related to occupational status, yet plausibly having distinct effects is race. Blacks are also occupationally segregated and may be sensitive to occupational sex-typing. Black women have historically greater labor force participation (especially blue collar work) than white women. For black women, occupational flexibility at white or blue collar levels offers upward mobility, and support for occupational sex-segregation should be lower among them. However, possibly sympathy could conflict with cross-sex occupational competition among black men if more women entered blue collar work.

Education relates to the first three predictors but provides a possible contrast to them. Education is more than a "pure status measure." It can cause a more tolerant civil liberties ideology and is related to other egalitarian attitudes toward women (e.g., Roper, 1974).

Finally, a contextual variable is used which is perhaps most conceptually related to occupational competition: the percentage female in the respondent's detailed (national) occupational category in 1970. Those in gender congruent, highly sex-typed jobs face less competition than those in jobs with more equal sex-ratios, and would face more competition if members of the other sex entered their fields. Holding a highly sex-typed, gender congruent job should relate to stronger opinion support for continued occupational sex-segregation.[8]

Table 1 presents zero order correlations of these variables with support

(Table 1 about here)

for occupational sex-segregation. Generally, the correlations offer small support for the above hypotheses. Women with lower NORC scores or less income are more, rather than less, likely to support occupational sex-typing. Among men, these two variables are unrelated to occupational sex-typing. Correlational differences between the sexes are statistically reliable for both NORC scores[9] ($\underline{z} = 2.24$, $p < .05$) and income ($\underline{z} = 2.61$, $p < .01$).

However, education is inversely related to occupational sex-typing for both sexes, and the correlations are similar in magnitude for men and women. While this result parallels the influence of income and occupational prestige for women, education does not seem to function as a "pure status" variable for men.

Among men, race is unrelated to occupational sex-typing (whites: $\bar{x} = 3.93$; blacks: $\bar{x} = 4.02$). Black women, however, are <u>more</u> likely than white to support occupational sex-segregation (4.10 versus 3.68). An interaction among sex, race, and occupational sex-typing occurs in this set of correlations (using race as a dummy varialbe, $\underline{z} = 2.44$, $p < .05$).

Finally, correlations using respondent's occupational sex-ratio are small, but congruent with expectations. Among men, <u>fewer</u> women in their occupations, and among women, <u>more</u> women in their occupations relate to greater support for occupational segregation. Those who would face increased cross-sex competition most, were occupational sex-segregation to lessen, are more likely to support sex segregation.

"Objective economic variables" usually do not operate in an economically "rational" way in this sample. Among women, lower occupational prestige, income, education, and being black all lead to greater sex-typing. This is

intriguing, for it is presisely these women who might gain most in a sex-integrated labor market. On the other hand, even social analysts have only recently begun to realize the importance of occupational sex-segregation for gender differences in occupational rewards. It is probable that poorly educated women (who are also more likely to be black or to hold low-status occupational positions) are less likely than well educated women to realize that male-dominated work at their own status level offers comparatively high monetary rewards and greater opportunities for advancement.

Among men, education is the only "status" indicator related to occupational segregation support. This relationship probably reflects issues apart from economic ones, since neither race, NORC scores, nor income predict occupational sex-typing among men. Potential economic competition from women may be perceived at all socio-economic status levels by men.

Results from the sex composition in the respondent's occupation do suggest that some economic variables modestly relate to occupational sex-segregation support. While the correlations are small, they suggest that those in gender-congruent, highly sex-typed fields may be more sensitive to the potential of cross-sex competition. Results from occupational sex-composition may offer some support for competition arguments because this variable may directly sensitize individuals to competition issues. Factors which may directly or indirectly alert individuals to potential competition may better predict public opinion on occupational sex-segregation than "objective status" variables. More subjective measures relevant to competition issues are presented below.

SUBJECTIVE ECONOMIC CONCERNS AND OCCUPATIONAL SEX-TYPING

Several issues enter into how cross-sex occupational competition may be

perceived. Those who are financially insecure, or who worry about unemployment or job insecurity have a stake in restricting new sources of competition. Occupational values may also be important. Because the pay is lower and advancement ladders shorter in female-dominated jobs, men who value high job income or occupational advancement may argue that (1) they (and other men) should avoid less desirable "female" jobs and (2) that women should avoid "men's work" because they could lower wages for all workers. In addition, men who believe that women now receive unfair economic advantages ("reverse discrimination") over men seem more apt to believe that women are competitors, and thus should be more likely to hold sex-typed occupational attitudes.

On the other hand, women who value high income or occupational advancement should be less likely to support occupational sex-segregation. With a more integrated labor market, women with these values would have greater chances to enter a wider range of occupations, including well paid male-dominated skilled blue collar and managerial work. In addition, there is no apparent reason why women who see women gaining from "reverse discrimination" to argue that occupations should continue to be sex-segregated.

Several measures were available dealing with subjective economic concerns. First, respondents were asked if they felt area unemployment was a very serious, somewhat serious, or not serious problem. Second, respondents ranked five factors in order of importance in choosing a new job; three of these (high income, job security, and chances for job advancement) are analyzed here. Third, four questions asked about "reverse discrimination" (personal knowledge of women receiving job advantages over men; how often this phenomenon occurred; how serious an issue this was in the area; and how often women received advantages

in college admissions). The average score of these four items forms a "perceived reverse discrimination" index.[10]

Table 2 presents relationships between subjective economic concerns and occupational sex-typing. Since those with lower NORC scores and less education

(Table 2 about here)

were more concerned about unemployment and job security, zero order and partial correlations (controlling education and NORC scores) are presented.

Perceived economic concerns do little better than objective economic status in predicting support for occupational sex-segregation. Although those who emphasize job security are more likely to support occupational segregation, the relationships vanish in the partial correlations. Men who perceive more serious area unemployment are less likely to hold sex-typed occupational norms. Why this is so is unclear. In addition, perceived "reverse discrimination" is unrelated to occupational sex-typing among men, but relates to greater sex-typing among women.

"Competition-exclusion" arguments receive modest support among men who value high income as an important job consideration. These men are more likely to support occupational sex-segregation, although men who value occupational advancement do not do so. Although women who value high income or job advancement would probably gain economically in an integrated labor market, in women, these values are unrelated to occupational sex-typing.

Overall, then, whether we consider objective economic status, perceptions of economic competition, or emphases on occupational gain, these variables do little to explain opinion support for occupational segregation. Among men, status factors (except education) are unrelated to occupational segregation

support. Men who might perceive direct or indirect threats from women workers generally are not more likely to support occupational sex-segregation.

The results for women do not favor an economic perspective either. Women low in occupational status are more likely to favor occupational segregation; women who value occupational rewards are neither more nor less likely to support occupational segregation. However, women who see women receiving (presumably "unfair") advantages in the labor market are more likely to support occupational sex-segregation. As a contrast to these results, an issue less directly relevant to an economic approach is addressed: occupational sex-segregation as a reflection of sex-segregation outside the labor market.

SEX-ROLE IDEOLOGY AND SUPPORT FOR OCCUPATIONAL SEX-SEGREGATION

Sex-segregation outside the labor market may or may not reflect competitive factors. Such segregation may arise by custom, familial practices, and other structural factors, and be supported by mythologies and ideologies which specify and support gender roles. Separatist practices in one subsystem of society often support similar practices in other subsystems. For example, written or unwritten rules that men should not do "women's work" (e.g., housekeeping) or that women should avoid heavy physical exertion or "dangerous" situations (e.g., sports, war) are not difficult to transfer to gender appropriate jobs in the labor market.

This segregated social system concept has its attitude counterpart in an ideology which stresses that women and men should have distinct roles. Individuals who want a sex-segregated world outside the labor force should also believe that the sexes should be occupationally segregated. That is, support for occupational sex-segregation is one subset of a large ideology of gender segregation.

The measure of sex-role ideology used here is the mean score received to 15 attitude questions,[11] none of which deal with labor market issues. Items tap the felt appropriateness of "feminine" behavior in men (e.g., crying, knitting, facial makeup), support of general issues such as the Equal Rights Amendment, status perogatives of each sex (e.g., in marriage proposals or "being protected") and the importance of "ladylike behavior" (e.g., wearing skirts) in women. Index scores range from one to four; high scores indicate support for sex-segregation in a wide variety of areas.

The systemic segregation perspective receives support from this public opinion data. Those who believe women and men should hold disparate roles outside the labor force also hold these beliefs about occupations (men: $r = .52$, $p < .001$; women: $r = .62$, $p < .001$). While relationships attenuate slightly controlling education and NORC score (men: partial = .46, $p < .001$; women: partial = .51, $p < .001$), the correlations remain moderately large.

In a final analysis, support for occupational sex-segregation is regressed on several economic, demographic, and attitude variables from earlier analyses. Table 3 presents standardized regression coefficients so that the relative efficacy of these factors for men and women can be compared.

(Table 3 about here)

In Table 3, the sex-role ideology measure is by far the best predictor of support for occupational sex-segregation among both sexes. In addition, men who see area unemployment as a more serious problem are still less likely to support occupational sex-typing, while men who value high job income or women who perceive more "reverse discrimination" are more likely to support occupational segregation. The differences between metric regression coeffi-

cients by sex are statistically significant[12] for perceived unemployment and emphasized job income. Further, status factors for women (race, NORC score, education, income) attenuate considerably in their effects when other variables are entered in regression. However, when compared with the ideology measure, even regression coefficients which are statistically significant have relatively small effects.

CONCLUSIONS

Occupational sex-segregation in America is a well documented phenomenon. Extensive consideration of why this is so is relatively recent, and the issue will grow in importance as still more women enter the labor force. Some current work concentrates on processes of economic competition and exclusion. Such arguments could theoretically extend to both sexes, although exclusion by males has received much greater attention in the literature. A different perspective addresses system-wide sex-segregation and the reciprocal spillover of segregation into the labor market.

In this study, responses have been analyzed from a set of occupations not only sex-typed in ceusus data, but also by sample respondents. Attitudes toward who should enter what occupation are strongly related to occupational sex-composition, and reflect the scattered data in other research which suggest that male-dominated blue collar work for women and "women's work" for men are points of resistance in public opinion. The data suggest that public support of occupational segregation both reflects current labor market practices and may be another factor which encourages occupational sex-segregation. It is also instructive to note that both male and female occupations are sex-typed by

respondents and that those who believe male-dominated jobs are "better for men" also hold that female-dominated jobs are "better for women." Public opinion support for occupational segregation does not only apply to restricting choices for women.

Economic variables play a surprisingly small role in predicting public support for occupational sex-segregation. This is especially true for sample men. Although men are proposed to have "more to lose" under occupational integration, economic factors (income, NORC scores, race) or employment insecurity are unrelated to greater occupational sex-typing among men in this sample. Even a measure of subjective competitive threat ("reverse discrimination") is unrelated to occupational segregation support among men. While men who rank high income as an important job consideration or who are in predominantly male jobs are more apt to support occupational segregation, these effects weaken or vanish in multiple regression analysis.

Those women who might gain most from an integrated labor market are not more likely to support such integration. Women low in objective occupational status or black women (many of whom were domestics in this sample) were least likely to support occupational integration. Women who value a high income or occupational advancement, which might be more easy to attain in an integrated labor market, are not more apt to support occupational integration. Thus, while economic considerations may be important on a structural level in occupational sex-segregation (but see Snyder and Hudis, 1976), in this sample, they play a small role in determining public opinion support for this phenomenon.[13]

More promising are suggestions that occupational sex-segregation reflects

a larger system of sex-segregation. Here, occupational roles reflect a generalized societal set of roles, which prescribe different behavior for each sex. In this sample, beliefs that each sex should have separate hobbies, appearance, and other social behaviors are definitely related to support of occupational segregation. The influence of ideology is relatively resistant to controls for other variables and is similar for both sexes, even though sex differences do occur on the influence of objective and subjective economic issues.

In conclusion, occupational sex-segregation is supported by a network of sex-typed occupational aspirations, training, and internalized norms which reflect and reinforce a larger system of sex-role segregation. These results suggest that even if women were paid equal wages with men, or the skills in male and female jobs rewarded equally, men and women would still be found in different labor markets. Without substantial structural and ideological change, even if men and women have equal labor force participation in the future, they are likely to occupy separate occupational worlds.

TABLE 1

Correlations Between Support for Occupational Sex-Segregation and Status and Occupational Context Variables

Support for Occupational[a] Sex-Segregation with:	MEN	WOMEN
(A) Education	-.34*	-.47*
(B) NORC Occupational Score	-.06	-.34*
(C) Earned income	.02	-.31*
(D) Race	-.06	-.36*
(E) Percent Female in Respondent's Occupation, 1970	-.16	.19*
Minimum N	105	124

[a]Relationships are Pearson Product-Moment correlations. High scores indicate greater support for occupational sex-segregation, more education, income, or female occupational sex-ratios, and higher NORC scores. Race is coded as a dummy variable (White = 1).

*$p < .05$

TABLE 2

Correlations Between Support for Occupational Sex-Segregation and Subjective Economic Variables

Support for Occupational[a] Sex-segregation with:	MEN	WOMEN
(A) Perceived Area Unemployment		
Zero-Order	-.21*	.04
Partial	-.24*	-.03
(B) Emphasis on Job Security		
Zero-Order	.14	.22*
Partial	.04	.04
(C) Emphasis on Job Income		
Zero-Order	.22*	.08
Partial	.21*	-.08
(D) Emphasis on Job Advancement		
Zero-Order	.05	-.09
Partial	.06	-.02
(E) Perceived "Reverse Discrimination"		
Zero-Order	-.05	.22*
Partial	-.04	.30*
Minimum N	105	124

[a]Zero-order relationships are Pearson Product-Moment correlations; partials are presented controlling education and NORC score. High scores indicate greater perceived area unemployment or reverse discrimination; for (B) through (D), high scores indicate this was ranked an important factor in choosing an occupation.

*$p < .05$

TABLE 3

A Comparison of Objective and Subjective Economic Factors and Sex-Role Ideology in Predicting Support for Occupational Sex-Segregation[a]

Support for Occupational[b] Sex-Segregation with:	MEN	WOMEN
Objective Economic Factors		
Race[c]	-.09	-.11
Percent Female in Occupation, 1970	-.01	.01
NORC Score	.02	-.09
Earned Income	.00	-.11
Education	-.17	-.19
Subjective Economic Factors		
Perceived Area Unemployment	-.29*	-.10
Emphasis on Job Income	.15*	-.06
Perceived "Reverse Discrimination"	.05	.24*
Sex-Role Ideology	.48*	.51*
R^2	.41	.52
N	107	126

[a]Coefficients presented are standardized regression coefficients (beta weights). All significance tests are performed on the unstandardized coefficients.

[b]High scores indicate greater support for occupational sex-segregation.

[c]Race is coded as a dummy variable (White = 1); high scores on the "Sex-Role Ideology" measure indicate greater sex-role segregation is desired. For further coding, see footnote a, Table 2.

* $p < .05$

FOOTNOTES

1. Note that the entrance of women into "male" professions occupies most of the literature on sex roles and occupations, a far greater share than the entrance of men into "women's work" or women into blue collar work. This is ironic since public opinion data indicate resistance is less on the former issue than on the latter two areas.

2. McLaughlin's findings undoubtedly are influenced by the predominance of white collar (especially professional) jobs among his "mixed sex" occupations.

3. The original sample consisted of 305 adults (an 81 percent response rate). Students or housewives are not used, so the data analysis includes only labor force (including temporarily unemployed) adults.

4. During pretesting, some occupations were discarded due to unfamiliarity with them (e.g., vegetable grader); other occupations were drawn from the nine cells as replacements. One occupation (pilot) was added to the Bose set to note responses to a male-dominated profession viewed as entailing physical risk.

5. From other data collected in this sample, it should be emphasized that the occupational items involve more than "preference." Occupations which were "better for women" (i.e., those with high proportions of women) were also listed as jobs men should <u>not</u> do on an open-ended question. Over half the sample felt there were jobs that women should not do. These jobs correspond to items receiving the largest "better for men" responses (work entailing physical labor or physical risk, skilled blue collar work).

6. The lack of relationship between prestige of the occupational item and

respondent responses to it is interesting. It should be noted, however that the rank order correlation between occupational item means and median male salary in the occupation is negative (r_s = -.37, n.s.); this correlation is in the right direction to support economic arguments about excluding women from better paying (but not more prestigeous) occupations.

7. "Equally oriented" items are comparatively poorly correlated with either "male oriented" (r = .27) or "female oriented" (r = -.26) items. If they are included in the support for occupational sex-segregation measure, the same substantive conclusions would be drawn from later analyses, but the effects of predictor variables are weaker. Mean scores are used here and on other composite measures to maximize the number of usable cases. Two missing values are allowed on the occupational sex-typing measure. The mean item correlation here is .39 and eocfficient alpha = .89.

8. Note an opposite argument could be made. Men in jobs with many women might resist further "feminizing" of the occupation, while women in jobs with few women might be tempted to play "Queen Bee."

9. Using Fisher's z transformation to test correlation differences in independent samples (Blalock, 1972: 406). Analogous results are obtained using analysis of variance or covariance. Alternative analyses suggest that curvilinear effects for NORC score, income, etc. do not occur.

10. One missing value was allowed during index construction. The item intercorrelations are relatively low ($\bar{r}$ = .18, coefficient alpha = .47).

11. Two missing values were allowed during index construction. The average item correlation is .23 (coefficient alpha = .82). Earlier, it was noted that in a systemic segregation approach to public opinion support for

occupational sex-segregation, economic factors become important only indirectly as they influence a larger ideology of sex-segregation. This is only partly supported by the correlations between the ideology measure and the economic factors used here among men. For men, the only correlation larger than .15 is that between education and sex-role ideology ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$). For women, however, correlations between status variables and ideology resemble the results from the occupational sex-typing measure, but are slightly smaller in magnitude (race: $r = -.29$; income: $r = -.20$; NORC score: $r = -.23$; education: $r = -.49$). On the other hand, perhaps themost direct measure of women as competitors ("reverse discrimination") has low correlations with ideology among both men ($r = -.01$) and women ($r = -.06$).

12. Dummy variable interaction terms are used to test sex differences between regression coefficients (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973). Significance tests for all regression coefficients (including interaction terms) were performed on unstandardized (metric) regression coefficients.

13. It is possible that different relationships might obtain with samples from different areas (e.g., heavily industrialized areas with high union membership). It should be emphasized, however, that the pattern of the occupational item marginals is highly congruent with other data relevant to this topic (e.g., Gallup, 1976).

REFERENCES

Blau, F. D. and C. L. Jusenius

1976 "Economists' Approaches to Sex Segregation in the Labor Force." Pp. 181-199 in M. Blaxall and B. Reagan (eds.) Women and the Workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blalock, H. M., Jr.

1972 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blaxall, M. and B. Reagan (eds.)

1976 Women and the Workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bonacich, E.

1972 "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." American Sociological Review 37: 547-559.

1976 "Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Race Relations in the United States: A Split Labor Market Interpretation." American Sociological Review 41: 34-51.

Bose, C.

1973 Jobs and Gender: Sex and Occupational Prestige. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University.

Duncan, O. D., H. Schuman, and B. Duncan

1973 Social Change in a Metropolitan Community. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fox, B. R.

1975 Sex Role Stereotyping by School Teachers: Determinants from Teacher's Current Family Roles. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan.

The Gallup Public Opinion Index

1976 Women in America. No. 128.

Grimm, J. W. and R. N. Stern

1974 "Sex Roles and Internal Labor Market Structures: The 'Female' Semi-Professions. Social Problems 21: 690-705.

Gross, E.

1968 "Plus Ca Change...? The Sexual Structure of Occupations Over Time." Social Problems 16: 198-208.

Hesselbart, S.

1977 "Women Doctors Win and Male Nurses Lose: A Study of Sex-Role and Occupational Stereotypes." Sociology of Work and Occupations 4: 49-62.

Hodge, R. W. and P. Hodge

1965 "Occupational Assimilation as a Competitive Process." American Journal of Sociology 71: 249-264.

Kerlinger, F. N. and E. Pedhazur

1973 Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lipman-Blumen, J.

1976 "Toward a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions." Pp. 15-31 in M. Blaxall and B. Reagan (eds.) Women and the Workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mason, K. O., J. L. Czajka, and S. Arber

1976 "Change in U.S. Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." American Sociological Review 41: 573-596.

McClendon, M. J.

1976 "The Occupational Status Attainment Processes of Males and Females." American Sociological Review 41: 52-64.

McLaughlin, S. D.

1977 "Occupational Characteristics, Occupational Sex-Typing and the Male-Female Income Differential." Unpublished manuscript.

Roby, P.

1975 "Sociology and Women in Working-class Jobs." Pp. 203-239 in M. Millman and R. Kanter (eds.) Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.

The Roper Organization

1974 The Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll, Vol. III.

Schlossberg, N. K. and J. Goodman

1972 "A Woman's Place: Children's Sex Stereotyping of Occupations." Vocational Guidance Quarterly June: 266-270.

Segal, B.

1962 "Male Nurses: A Case Study in Status Contradictions and Prestige Loss." Social Forces 41: 31-38.

Siegel, C. L.

1973 "Sex Differences in the Occupational Choices of Second Graders." Journal of Vocational Behavior 3: 15-19.

Tully, J. C., C. Stephan and B. J. Chance

1976 "The Status and Sex-Typed Dimensions of Occupational Aspirations in Young Adolescents." Social Science Quarterly 56: 638-649.

U.S. Department of Commerce

1976 "Major Field of Study of College Students: October, 1974." Current Population Reports, P-20, No. 289.